

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 and 8-10 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 5, and 6 are amended and Claims 8-10 are added by the present amendment

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Fujinami et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,485,280, herein "Fujinami"), and Claims 2-4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fujinami and Seo (U.S. Patent No. 6,798,980), both of which are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

In view of the outstanding rejections on the merits, independent Claims 1, 5, and 6 are amended to recite that a supervision unit supervises a start of a recording process by a first recording unit, as disclosed in the originally filed specification. No new matter has been added.

Briefly recapitulating, independent Claim 1 is directed to a recording and playback apparatus for encoding inputted AV signals. The apparatus includes production means for encoding the inputted AV signals using a first coding system to produce first coded data, first recording means for recording the first coded data onto a recording medium, supervision means for supervising a start of a recording process by the first recording means, readout means for reading out the first coded data recorded on the recording medium, conversion means for converting the first coded data read out from the recording medium by the readout means into second coded data corresponding to a second coding system, and second recording means for recording the second coded data converted by the conversion means onto the recording medium. The readout means, conversion means, and the second recording means are operable to execute the respective processes simultaneously with the recording

process by the first recording means, when the start of the recording process by the first recording means is supervised, based on a result of the supervision by the supervision means.

Independent Claim 5 is a method claim that recites steps describing the functionality of the claimed elements in Claim 1 and Claim 6 is a storage medium reciting the method steps of Claim 5.

In a non-limiting example, Figure 1 shows the apparatus having the first recording means 12, the supervision means 18, the readout means 15, the conversion means 20, the second recording means 21, and the recording medium 13.

As disclosed in the specification in the paragraph bridging pages 7 and 8, the claimed apparatus is capable of receiving a first signal having a first coding system and recording the first signal on the recording medium and also converting the first signal to a second signal having a second coding system and recording the second signal on the same recording medium. In this regard, Figure 1 shows that the first recording means 12 records the first signal on the recording medium 13 and the second recording means 21 records the second signal on the *same* recording medium 13.

Turning to the applied art, Fujinami discloses an apparatus for deriving from a motion picture film a video signal having an increased vertical resolution for a display using progressive scanning. In this regard, Fujinami discloses with regard to Figure 4 that a telecine apparatus 2 reproduces a picture from a picture film 1 and generates a high-definition video signal representing each frame of the motion picture film (see at column 5, lines 41-54). The signal from the telecine apparatus 2 is transmitted then to a high-definition video recording unit (HD-VTR) 3 to record on a corresponding recording medium (not shown) the signal from the telecine apparatus 2. An interlaced high-definition video signal is reproduced by the HD-VTR 3 and is fed to a down converter 4, which reduces a number of lines in the number of pixels to convert the input interlaced high-definition video signal into a video

signal of the type used in normal television broadcasting (see column 6, lines 9-18). The interlaced video signal then is recorded by a standard-definition video recorder unit (SD-VTR) 5 and then fed to an encoder 90. The encoder 90 converts the interlaced signal into a composite video signal and feeds the signal to the duplicating apparatus 6 to record the composite video signal on a consumer-format video cassette or video disk.

The outstanding Office Action asserts that the HD-VTR 3 corresponds to the claimed first recording means, the duplicating apparatus 6 corresponds to the claimed second recording means, and the down converter 4 corresponds to the claimed conversion means.

However, the outstanding Office Action does not identify which element of Fujinami corresponds to the claimed readout means and further, does not identify which recording medium in Fujinami corresponds to the claimed recording medium. In this respect, it is noted that *each of* the HD-VTR 3, the SD-VTR 5, and the duplicating apparatus 6 in Fujinami has its own recording medium on which a respective signal is recorded.

On the contrary, independent Claims 1, 5, and 6 recite that the first recording means and the second recording means record the first coded data and the second coded data onto the *same recording medium*.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Fujinami not does not teach or suggest supervision means for supervising *a start* of the recording process by the first recording means, as recited by amended Claims 1, 5, and 6.

Further, the outstanding Office Action states in the paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3 that Fujinami discloses at column 8, line 63, to column 9, line 21 that the readout means, the conversion means, and the second recording means simultaneously execute respective processes with the first recording means.

However, the identified paragraphs in Fujinami disclose only that switches 27, inside the down converter 4, switch various signals from memory banks 22 to memory banks 26 to

transmit information from the HD-VTR 3 to the SD-VTR 5. Fujinami is silent about any simultaneous processing and it appears that the HD-VTR 3, the down converter 4, and the SD-VTR 5 process information sequentially and not simultaneously.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that switching various signals from one device to another device as in Fujinami does not correspond to the claimed feature of simultaneously processing information by the readout means, the conversion means, the second recording means, and the first recording means, as required by independent Claims 1, 5, and 6.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 5, and 6 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Fujinami.

The outstanding Office Action relies on Seo for disclosing that the first coding system is MPEG2 and the second coding system is MPEG1. However, Seo does not cure the deficiencies of Fujinami discussed above with regard to independent Claims 1, 5, and 6.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 5, and 6 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Fujinami and Seo, either alone or in combination.

New Claims 8-10 have been added to set forth the invention in a varying scope and Applicants submit the new claims are supported by the originally filed specification. New independent Claims 8 and 10 recite setting means for setting whether a converter automatically converts the first coded data into the second coded data with the recording process by the recorder and the converter converts the first coded data into the second coded in case the setting means is set as to automatically convert the first coded data with the recording process, as disclosed in the specification, for example in paragraph [0036]. No new matter has been added.

The applied art does not teach or suggest the claimed automatic conversion of the first coded data into the second coded data with the recorded process as required by new Claims 8

and 10. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that new Claims 8-10 also patentably distinguish over the applied art.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)
BDL:RFF\la
I:\ATTY\RFF\275\275791\275791US-AM 6-12-07.DOC

Remus F. Fetea, Ph.D.
Registration No. 59,140